5-2018

Thai-English Code-Mixing in Thai Reality Television Shows: The Face Thailand Season Two and The Face Men Thailand Season One

Ekkarat Ruanglertsilp
St. Cloud State University

Thai-English Code-Mixing in Thai Reality Television Shows: *The Face Thailand* Season Two and *The Face Men Thailand* Season One

by

Ekkarat Ruanglertsilp

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

Saint Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts in

Teaching English as a Second Language

May, 2018

Thesis Committee:
Edward Sadrai, Chairperson
Choonkyong Kim
Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson

Abstract

This study examines the linguistic phenomena of Thai and English code-mixing on Thai modeling competition reality television shows: *The Face Thailand* season two and *The Face Men Thailand* season one. These two shows were chosen because of their higher frequency in the number of code-mixing by bilingual individuals on the shows compared to other Thai reality television shows. The study investigates the relationships of gender and role of the bilingual cast members with the incidences of code-mixing. This is to gain insight into whether the male cast members code-mixed more frequently than the female cast members, and whether the cast members who have the roles of mentor code-mixed more frequently than those who have the roles of contestants. With regard to the investigation, recorded data from each of the reality television shows was collected from the first five episodes, standardized, and analyzed with statistical independent sample T-test. The results revealed that female cast members have a higher number of code-mixing incidents than their male counterparts. However, statistics showed that this number is statistically insignificant. In terms of roles, the results revealed that the mentors code-mixed more frequently than the contestants and the number is statistically significant. These results provided support which both conform to and challenge the existing literature done by a number of researchers in the field. The results also suggested possible reasons which explain why the bilingual cast members on the shows employed the switching between Thai and English in their conversations.

Keywords: Code-mixing, language and gender, reality television shows, Thai-English code-mixing

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis chairperson, Dr. Edward Sadrai, for being my valuable source of advice, knowledge, and inspiration on the linguistic topic of code-switching and code-mixing. I would also like to acknowledge the rest of my thesis committee for their guidance and constructive feedbacks. I would like to thank Dr. Choonkyong Kim for specifically assisting me develop a sound statistical analysis in this study. I am also grateful for Dr. Marla Kanengieter-Wildeson for her constructive comments from a rhetoric point of view, and her time to be on my thesis committee.

Further, I thank all my friends and colleagues for their endless support and their confidence in my Master's study accomplishment. Finally, I would like to express my utterly profound appreciation to my parents who had always been my great moral and emotional support throughout my time at Saint Cloud State University. This educational success would not have been possible without them.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

List of Tables

Chapter I: Introduction

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the English language came into contact with Thai language through political maneuvering. Regardless, Thailand has remained a monolingual society up until the present day. With a trend of globalization, however, a large number of English lexemes and phrases have been adopted. They have also been embedded with Thai linguistic structures such as in the lexical, phrasal, and clausal levels. In regards to these linguistic structures, Gumperz (1982) defines code-switching as "the juxtaposition within the same exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different systems or subsystems." There are many English lexemes that despite the significant phonological and morphological transformations that they have undergone in other languages, they can still be recognized by native English speakers. If the influence and power of the English language caused such linguistic combinations at a time when education was the only access to language and culture, then, it could be expected that in the age of mass media and globalization, English as lingua franca would exert a similar impact on other languages, especially on Thai language in the context of this study.

In both classic and current literature, code-switching is mainly associated with communities which have two or more official languages (Tatsioka, 2010). While this is not the case in Thailand, this study examines language contact phenomenon occurring in Thailand, an otherwise monolingual society in a sense of language use on a daily basis. More specifically, in Thailand, the language used in educational contexts, public sector, laws, and governmental domains are standard Thai, spoken by the majority of the Thai population. Nevertheless, English as a foreign language has always been promoted in the Thai community by means of public and private educational curricula because of the perception that English represents social prestige.

In addition, according to Kannaovakun & Gunther (2001), code-switching involves intersentential switching or switching between sentences. This type of switching includes switching above the clausal level. Additionally, code-mixing involves intrasentential switching, which refers to switching between languages within one sentence. This type of switching includes switching at the lexical, phrasal and clausal levels. Compared to code-mixing, code-switching is a rare language phenomenon in Thailand. Thus, I adopted the definition of code-mixing provided by Kannaovakun & Gunther (2001) in this study. I also used the term 'code-mixing' in chapter four (Results), five (Discussions), and six (Conclusion). This is because the switching between Thai and English in Thai reality television shows always occurred within a sentence.

However, for the purpose of reviewing the literature of code-switching and code-mixing, I employed the term "code-switching" more generally in chapter two (Literature Review) to include both code-switching and code-mixing, and to include any situations in which the two languages are used.

One should also note that the definitions provided by Kannaovakun and Gunther (2001) may not be the orthodox way of defining code-switching and code-mixing. These two terms can also be used interchangeably in linguistics studies regarding morphology, syntax, and other formal aspects of language by other researchers (Bokamba, 1989).

The current study is an attempt to fill the need to analyze the modern and common phenomenon of Thai-English code-mixing, especially in the Thai mass media, and in particular, reality television programs. The major aim of this study is to fill the gap in the literature of code-mixing in this respect. Considering the intention of this study is to investigate the modern phenomenon of Thai-English code-mixing in mass media, the focus is on current Thai television

series as the target corpus to be investigated. These shows are globalized and influenced by modernity from the western world in a variety of ways, including not only the format of the programs in question, but more importantly, for the purposes of this study, the language used on these shows.

Rosenthal (1995) states that the art forms of scripted television shows reflect reality of human interaction. Fact and fiction are always encouraged in writing screenplays for television shows. A great numbers of television dramas today are based on real-life events. My study examined whether Thai-English code-mixing in the selected television series mirror naturally occurring data reported in the literature. In short, I have chosen Thai reality television series as the corpus for investigation because they are fairly new, modernized, portray how each gender uses language, and can be considered loosely scripted. The semi-scripted nature of reality television series serves to makes this study more compelling.

In investigating Thai-English constructions in reality television series, this study considers patterns of language use by male and female use of mixed variety in various domains of language use. These patterns included the number of mixing by each gender as well as other factors that may correlate with language use by different genders. I have also observed domains of language use in which male or female casts code-mixed more frequently than the other, and I also discovered that female and male casts have different patterns when code-mixing in different domains.

Chapter II: Literature Review

In this chapter, various interrelated studies and frameworks are reviewed. The review of studies and frameworks are in the following order: history of English language in Thailand, English language in Thai media, language contact, bilingualism, code-mixing and code-switching, borrowing words, factors influencing code-switching, domains of language use, non-standard form of language, communities of practice, language and gender, prestige in language contact situations, reality TV shows, and art and reality.

History of English Language in Thailand

This section is a review of how the English language was firstly introduced in Thailand, the necessity of Thai people acquiring the language to safeguard the country's independence, and how the English language has been adopted in Thai media up until the present. According to Masavisut et al. (1986), the history of the English language in Thailand, previously known as Siam, dated back to the turn of the nineteenth century. The influence of the western imperialism was threatening to many countries in Asia, and Thailand was no exception. King Rama III (1824-1851) of Siam was well aware of the western power, and the risk that could have affected the kingdom's security if he had not abided to the west's proposition which was to modernize Siam or it could lose its independence. Therefore, he unwillingly compromised to them, which led to the Burney Treaty of 1826, the agreement which resulted in contact with the western culture to the country. During that time, Britain was on its mission to attack China, which Snidvongs (1959) calls "the greatest nation known to the Siamese." This incidence made the Siamese realize that their country's independence was at stake if they did not start learning western culture, which included the English language. Nevertheless, it was not until 1851 that King Mongkut (1851-1868) protected the country from the West. He opened the country to

prove to the West that Siam was a civilized country and the equivalent of any foreign powers. King Mongkut and his ministers had been learning the English language from American missionaries during King Rama III reign, and this impressed the British so much that they agreed to sign another treaty to launch Siam for foreign trade instead of declaring war. This development of Siam was viewed as a way to protect its independence (Masavisut et al., p.198).

However, not only the British brought the arrival of English language to Thailand at the beginning, but the Americans after the end of World War II did also. Masavisut et al. (1986) claims that it was during the period of Vietnam War that the influence of western culture spread extensively through a variety of Thai popular segments. This was mostly facilitated by the presence of 50,000 U.S. military personnel who were stationed in Thailand (p. 200).

English Language in Thai Media

English language is used extensively in most types of media in Thailand. Nevertheless, Masavisut et al. (1986) found that several groups of Thai educated people, namely, policymakers, business people, media people, and people from academia use only a certain number of media sources to receive English news and information. The most popular sources among the groups are journals and newspapers, while radio and television rank at the bottom. Sukwiwat (1985), reported one of the reasons why journals and newspapers are popularly ranked at the top is because international news and information are disseminated through these means, and they have deeper coverage and more in-depth analyses.

English language in Thai radio and television. In this subsection, I will provide a review of English language used in Thai radio and television due to the focus on the use of Thai-English code-mixing in Thai reality television shows.

Radio and television programs in Thailand are primarily broadcasted in Thai. However,

there are quite a number of programs in which English is used as the primary language. FM Radio of Thailand, an organization run by Public Relations Department, transmits English-translated version of Thai local news and foreign news programs to listeners. Furthermore, English-language radio programs such as BBC, Voice of America, and Radio Japan can be tuned in through special frequencies announced by *TV and Radio Guide* (Masavisut et al., 1986).

For television programs, Masavisut et al. (1986) reports that there are less opportunities for Thai people to watch English language television programs than to listen to on the radio. All feature films broadcasted on television are dubbed in Thai. However, with the advent of globalization and novel trend within the past decade, as Kanaovakun and Gunther (2001) reported that, "Thai society has begun to experience globalization in almost all aspects of life (p. 2)," many Western-educated Thais chose to watch online English videos on the internet or purchase cable TV service with many English-speaking programs broadcasted from abroad. In summary, it appears that some Thai people have chosen to use English language to expand their opportunities for international education and business and to further broaden their horizons in today's globalized world (Masavisut et al., p. 203).

Language Contact

The history of how English and Thai languages came into contact supports the definition of Language Contact given by Sarah G. Thomason (2001). Thomason (2001) defines the concept in the simplest definition as "the use of more than one language in the same place at the same time" (p.1). She also goes on to provide a more specific definition by stating that language contact requires some communication between speakers of different languages. Nevertheless, the speakers do not need to be complete bilinguals or multilinguals (Thomason, 2001, p. 1). This definition supports the history of how Thai people in the past reluctantly agreed to learning

English for fear that they might lose their independence to the West (Masavisut, Sukwiwat, & Wongmontha, 1986). Thailand has always been a monolingual society and had to adjust itself to the western culture (Masavisut et al., 1986). Several examples of where language contact occurs are also given by Thomason (2001) as follows: the practice of labor force import, slave trade, when people come together for a specific purpose, close cultural connection that evolves among old neighbors (tribe merging, intermarriage, children adoption), and education or learned contact (p.20).

Bilingualism

The definition of the term "Bilingualism" has been argued from a variety of perspectives by various linguists. According to Bloomfield (1933), "native-like control of two languages" is the criterion for bilingualism (p. 56). However, according to Haugen (1953), bilingualism begins when the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language (p. 7). Myers-Scotton (2006) defines it as "the ability to use two or more languages sufficiently to carry on a limited casual conversation" (p. 44). Additionally, Diebold (1964), offered what may be called a minimal definition of bilingualism when he proposed the term "incipient bilingualism" to consider the beginning stages of contact between two languages. This signifies that a person may be bilingual to some degree, but not be able to produce complete meaningful sentences. Linguists usually define this type of bilingual as "passive", "receptive" bilingualism and even "semibilingualism." These usually mean to be able to understand, but not able to speak (to varying degrees).

The sociology of bilingualism. The decision to use one language over others occurs frequently for bilinguals. Nonetheless, the linguistic choices that bilinguals make are often

influenced by certain social components. In this subsection, a relationship between language and society is reviewed.

Societies are composed of a variety of domains which require respect and specific behavior in terms of clothing, gestures, and language use. For instance, we cannot wear our bathing suit to enter a Buddhist temple in Thailand. Similarly, we cannot use certain language varieties in particular social domains because the linguistic behavior is either regulated by law or the society we live in, or because we feel more comfortable expressing ourselves in another language in that situation. People may employ different language varieties to portray social distance, power relations, solidarity, formality or informality, emotions, facts (Holmes, 2001, p. 8-9).

Code-Mixing and Code-Switching

According to Kannaovakun and Gunther (2001), the definitions of code-switching and code-mixing are defined as follows: "code-mixing involves intrasentential switching, and code-switching intersentential switching. Code-switching, involving linguistic units above the clause level, is rare in Thailand" (p. 67). Moreover, other researchers including Thomason (2001), also have definitions of code-switching and code-mixing which are similar to that of Kannaovakun and Gunther (2001). Thomason (2001) defines code-switching as intersentential switching, which is the switching from one language to another at a sentence boundary. Meanwhile, code-mixing is associated with the term intrasentential switching, in which the switches between languages occur within a single sentence (p. 132). Examples of the distinction can be observed as follows:

Code-switching/intersentential switching (English-Greek Cypriot):

(1) **This is a long story.** Itun mesa se ena mikro xorio, tin E…[name].

This is a long story. They were in a little village, E…[name]. (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p. 2)

Code-mixing/intrasentential switching (Yiddish-English):

(2) **Di kender geen tsu** high school

The children go to high school. (Thomason, 2001, p. 132)

It can be observed that in intrasentential switching (code-mixing), the switching takes place at a word level in which the switched word is inserted into a sentence that is in an entirely different language (Thomason, 2001, 132).

Nonetheless, one should also note that the terms code-mixing and code-switching are also used interchangeably in many studies. This is because, according to Bokamba (1989), "the distinction between code-mixing and code-switching is often blurred in literature review where the two phenomena are treated as if they were co-extensive" (p. 279).

In this thesis, the term "code-mixing", is used with the data I collected because the switching between Thai and English in Thai reality television shows always occurred at intrasentential or at code-mixing level. Therefore, this term is more appropriate in chapter 4 (Results), chapter 5 (Discussions), and chapter 6 (Conclusion). However, for the purpose of reviewing the literature of code-switching and code-mixing, I employed the term "code-switching" more generally to include both code-switching and code-mixing and to include any situations in which two languages are used.

The notion of why and how people code-switch can give insights that help understand many aspects of language and speech. It not only demonstrates how languages are organized, processed, and produced in the brain but also demonstrates that bilinguals often switch languages at functional level to show deeper meaning of their superficial level of words. Monolinguals can also code-switch as well. They can switch between dialects, registers, degree of formality and intonations (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p. 4).

Tabouret-Keller (1997) and Sebba and Wooton (1998) stated that certain ways in which bilinguals code-switch in a particular community can portray their group identity, for example, a unique accent. Equally important, relative role of linguistic and sociolinguistic factors can be revealed by comparing the way bilingual people code-switch through different communities and different language combinations. Furthermore, in a particular society, sub-groups can also be identified by the patterns they use in code-switching. It is similar to how monolinguals use language to portray their identity, through discourse styles and registers. Therefore, it can be said that code-switching helps us understand identity expression and formation among bilinguals (p. 262-266).

In addition, by analyzing code-switched constructions, we can learn a great deal about the structure of a language. For example, we can learn which combinations of words or morphemes from different languages can be put together and which are more unacceptable in a particular language. Therefore, we can also say that code-switching helps us understand a staple issue in linguistics: the division between grammar and lexicon (Romaine, 1995).

Code-Switching and Borrowing

Code-switching and borrowing can be quite similar to non-specialists. However, there are a variety of English words that Thai language borrows from the western world because it simply does not have a lexical item for them. However, sometimes, Thai language does have the lexical items in question, but they are not used extensively due to lack of popularity. Examples are computer, office, plug, lipstick etc. These English words are used widely by Thai people including Thai monolinguals. According to Gumperz (1982), the distinction of code-switching and borrowing is indicated as follows:

> Borrowing can be defined as the introduction of a single word or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases from one variety into the other. The items in question are incorporated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. They are treated as part of its lexicon, take on its morphological characteristics and enter into its syntactic structures. Code-switching, on the other hand 'relies on the meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must consciously or subconsciously process as strings formed according to the internal rules of two distinct grammatical systems' (Gumperz, 1982, p. 66).

Therefore, English lexical items which are treated as part of Thai lexicon, and used by Thai monolinguals extensively are considered borrowing words, not code-switching, and are not included in this study.

Factors Influencing Code-Switching

There are various factors to why one code-switches. It is worthwhile at this stage to investigate a series of frequently explored factors as they are valid and reasonable to explain why the casts on Thai reality television shows code mixed.

According to Gumperz (1970), code-switching may put an emphasis on varying degrees of speaker involvement. For example, one can code-switch between English and Spanish in a conversation about giving up smoking. The person's choice of speech forms signifies his alternation between clinical detachment about his own condition and embarrassment. Spanish sentences portray personal involvement while English marks more general or detached statements (p. 135). Gumperz (1970) also relates this interpretation to other code-switching situations: the majority language (they code) is associated with more formal and less personal outsider relations, while the "we code" is associated with in-group and informal activities (p. 153).

Switching into minority language can signify group solidarity (Grosjean, 1982, p. 153). According to Di Pietro (1977), among Italian immigrants, code-switching from standard Italian to a dialect served to strengthen and unite those Italians who felt alienated from their homeland and unwelcome in the new country. Another instance is that Italians immigrants would tell a joke in English and deliver the punch line in Italian, not only because it is better told in that language but also to emphasize the notion that they all belonged to the same minority group with shared values and experiences.

Another reason that people code-switch is to amplify or emphasize a point. Hoffman (1971) reports some instances where code-switching at the end of an argument helps to terminate the interaction. One example is that, in Puerto Rican community in Jersey City, the mothers utter short orders to their children in English, such as “Stop that,” and “Don’t do that.” This is interesting to observe because the rest of the mother’s utterances are in Spanish, and switching to English signifies to the children that the mother is getting serious and angry.

Code-switching is also used to exclude someone from a portion of the conversation. This is especially used by bilingual parents frequently with their monolingual children. Di Pietro (1977) stated that Italian American parents switch to Italian to discuss adult conversation to keep their young English-speaking children away from listening. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to note that code-switching to exclude someone from a conversation can have an impact which leads to embarrassment. Grosjean (1982) also provided one real-life example; two Russian-English bilingual teenagers were sitting in a New York bus when a rather plump lady came aboard. One teenager code-switched from English to Russian and said, “We’d better make room for the fat cow,” and moved over to give up a seat. The plump lady took the seat and said in disdain “The fat cow thanks you!”

Code-switching to raise one's status and give one additional authority or expertise is also worthy to explore according to Grosjean (1982). Myers-Scotton and Ury (1977) provide an example of this reason for switching in Kenya. A bus passenger in Narobi and a fare collector were having a conversation in Swahili. The passenger said he would like to commute to the post office. The fare collector told him that the fare was fifty cents. So, the passenger gave him a shilling and the fare collector told him to wait for his change. As the bus came closer to the post office, the passenger became worried that he would not get his change and told the fare collector again:

(3) Passenger: Nataka change yangu. (I want my change.)

Fare Collector: Change utapata, Bwana. (You'll get your change, mister.)

Passenger: I am nearing my destination.

Fare Collector: Do you think I could run away with your change? (p. 156)

Grosjean (1982) goes on to conclude that code-switching can also be used for many other reasons. These reasons are: quoting what someone has said (and thereby emphasizing one's group identity), specifying the addressee (switching to the usual language of a particular person in a group will show that one is addressing that person), qualifying what has been said, or talking about past events (p. 155).

To conclude this subsection, a list of uses of code-switching proposed by François Grosjean (1982), is presented. Some reasons for code-switching are as follows:

- Fill a linguistic need for lexical item, set phrase, discourse marker, or sentence filler
- Continue the last language used (triggering)
- Quote someone
- Specify addressee

- Qualify message: amplify or emphasize (“topper” in argument)
- Specify speaker involvement (personalize message)
- Mark and emphasize group identity (solidarity)
- Convey confidentiality, anger, annoyance
- Exclude someone from conversation
- Change role of speaker: raise status, add authority, show expertise

Domains of Language Use

According Tatsioka (2010), in societies where bilingualism exist, language choice can be determined based on the domain in which it is used. For instance, a standard variety such as an official or national language may be used in public institutions, education or for legal proceedings. However, an unofficial language, and sometimes an official language, are used in meetings with friends and families because of various language choices of bilinguals. Therefore, we can see that language choice cannot always be predicted, unless we familiarize ourselves with the social norms and conventions that govern each linguistic community (p. 9).

The prediction of language choice can be difficult. Therefore, linguists have conducted experiments in order to investigate the correlations between the choices of language and the domains of language. Fishman, Cooper and Ma (1971), conducted a research in a Puerto Rican community in New York and concluded that there are five different domains which either English or Spanish was employed more frequently than the other. The five domains are as follows: family, friendship, religion, employment and education. Results of the research demonstrate that Spanish was most likely to be used in the family and friendship domains, followed by the others. Other researchers, such as Mackey (1968), connected bilingualism to specific behavior like diary writing, note-taking, praying, dreaming and cursing. Additionally,

Fantini (1985), related bilingualism to private communication and practice of thinking out loud after the observation of his son who uses Spanish in both situations, which was also used at home.

Non-Standard Form of Language, Code-Switching, and Gender

A strong relationship between the use of language choice and gender as a variable has been reported in the literature. The findings that women use standard forms of language more than men have been supported by multiple researchers (Trudgil, 1972; Shuy, Wolfram & Riley, 1967) According to Cheshire and Gardner-Cholors (1998), the use of code-switching/mixing is considered non-standard forms of language. Nevertheless, the issue of gender and non-standard forms derives from monolingual settings (Gardner-Cholors, 2009).

Trudgil (1972) found that women in Norwich use standard British English, considered the prestige form, in their speech more frequently than men. It is claimed that male speakers have more favorable attitudes toward speaking with working class speech features[1]. It is concluded in the study that there is a pattern of how language is adopted by each gender; standard forms are adopted by middle class women and non-standard forms by working-class men (p.1). Trudgil (1972) also provided interesting interconnected explanatory factors for the pattern. First, he claimed that women in societies are more conscious about status than men, therefore, they are more sensitive to the significance of linguistic variables used in their societies. Trudgil (1972), claims that this may be due to the conception of how women have a less secure and subordinate social position to that of the men. Thus, it is more critical for women to secure their social

[1] Covert Prestige: This form of prestige refers to non-standard varieties which are often said to have covert prestige ascribed to them by their speakers. This variety is usually not accepted in all social groups, for example, youth language (“Ello”, 2018).

position through the use of language that signifies prestige. Equally important, women are not socially rated by their professional success, or earning power like men. However, they are socially rated on how they appear instead, therefore, speech plays a significant role in signifying women's social statuses. Second, working class culture in some Western societies is known to have connotations of masculinity. This may be because men consider roughness and toughness features of working class lifestyle to be desirable masculine attributes. Nevertheless, these features are not considered desirable feminine traits. Sophistication and refinement are much more preferred for women (p. 183). This study produced results which corroborate the findings of the previous work in this field. Shuy et al. (1967) also reported in their study that multiple negation in a sentence such as "*I don't want nothing*" can be observed more in speech produced by men than women in Detroit. This finding was collected from their large-scale sociolinguistic survey and it yielded quite the same pattern of the British Norwich society.

In contrast to earlier findings, however, Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998), found that there is no evidence of any consistent pattern of sex differentiation in bilingual communities. They assume that the reason why there is no such evidence is because code-switching has different connotations in different communities, and that social norms of women and men differ a great deal in different communities. For instance, as Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998) stated, "Panjabi women in Birmingham who never have occasion to speak monolingually do not have monolingual discourse as part of their linguistic repertoire" (p. 28). This phenomenon may account for the fact that code-switching has little or no special significance to them at all (Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros, 1998, p. 28).

Research results indicated that there is a degree of inconsistency between the pattern of sex differentiation and the use of standard/non-standard form of language from both monolingual

and bilingual societies. Considering the aforementioned inconsistency, the theories on gender and the use of standard forms of language may not be sufficient to explain the notion why one gender uses standard forms of language more frequently than the other. Therefore, I will consider another concept called "communities of practice" which may explain why certain groups of people use languages in different ways in the next section.

Communities of Practice

In order to investigate the variability of language used in a society, there is another factor worth reviewing besides the issue of language and gender. Considering the issue of gender alone to decide how one uses language is simply not sufficient. Communities of practice proposed by Eckert (2016) also plays a great role on how one uses languages. This section provides a general review of the concept of community of practice. According to Eckert (2016), she defines community of practice as "a collection of people who engage on an ongoing basis in some common endeavor. Communities of practice emerge in response to common interest or position, and play an important role in forming their members' participation in, and orientation to, the world around them" (p.1). This concept generates a connection between the individual, the group, and place in the wider social order, and it also provides a setting where linguistic practice appears as a function of this link. For instance, community of practice can be a book club, a bowling team, a friendship group, a crack house, a church congregation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Therefore, people engaged in conversations on reality TV shows can be considered forming a "community of practice."

The construct of communities of practice was integrated into sociolinguistics as a means to theorize language and gender by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1992). This integration identifies a social group not only in the shared abstract characteristics aspects (e.g. class, gender) or simple

co-presence (e.g. neighborhood, workplace), but also in shared practices. For example, a white working-class Italian-American woman does not directly adopt her style of speaking from the bigger categories working class, Italian-American and female, but from her everyday experience as an individual who combines those three memberships (Eckert, 2006, p.1-2). All in all, using only the issue of gender to decide how one uses language is not sufficient, in and of itself, because communities of practice emerge in relations to common interests or positions, and play a significant role in creating their members' participation in, and orientation to, the world around individuals (Eckert, 2006, p.3). In short, returning to the westernized Thai reality television shows as the community of practice for the casts to interact with each other, certain linguistic styles may be adopted among cast members.

Language and Gender

Since my study focuses on the differences of how men and women use language, theories of language and gender is reviewed in this section. The presentation of this section is in the following order: the study of language and gender, women's speech characteristics, and men's speech characteristics.

The study of language and gender. Language and gender is a prevalent subject which often combines the theories of linguistics and sociology. This subject has always been complex, and not only regarded as a linguistic phenomenon, but also as a social phenomenon. It mainly examines varieties of speech according to a particular gender and social norms for such gender language use. The study of language and gender also aims to reflect social psychology and cultural value orientation which help us explain the factors in the internal change of language development. Many linguists throughout the world have done a great number of profound and extensive exploration in order to explain the cause of gender difference in languages (Jinyu,

2014).

Men and women have different ways in using language (Shuy, Wolfram & Riley, 1967). According to Tannen (1990), men's and women's talks are cultural products. She states that men perceive the societies they live in as a "hierarchical social order". In order to maintain the status they desire within the hierarchy, they need to guard their independence. "Since a man will either be 'one-up' or 'one down', conversations become negotiation for status, life becomes a struggle or contest, and relationships become asymmetrical" she asserts. On the contrary, most women engage in societies as individuals "in a network of connections". They perceive conversations as negotiations for intimacy, sharing, and community. Therefore, women desire symmetrical relationships where everyone's position is equivalent (p. 24-25). Tannen (1990) does not state that one of these styles is superior than the other, but that both styles should be fully understood in order to prevent misunderstanding and resentment. Both styles given by Tannen (1990) can be seen in her example of a conflict of a fictional married couple, Josh and Linda. Josh's old friend was coming into town and they planned to have a night out. When Josh told Linda about their plan, Linda was not impressed. This was because she was going to be away on a business trip the week before, and when she came back, Josh would be out with his friend. Linda was upset because Josh made his own decision without consulting with her first like any couple would do. Linda just would never make any plans, even for an evening without first discussing it with Josh. She could not understand why Josh could not provide her with the same courtesy. On the contrary, Josh's thought was completely different. He protested that he did not want to tell his friend that he had to ask his wife for permission. This would imply that he was not independent and lost his status as a "man" in society. (Tannen, 1990, pp. 26- 27).

Women's speech features. Modern study of language and gender started when Lakoff (1973) published her iconic work called "*Language and women's place*" (1973). In *Language and women's place* (1973), Lakoff views women's language use as weaker than that of the men. She claims that the powerlessness of women can be both reflected in the way women are expected to speak and the fashion in which women are spoken of.

Lakoff (1973) also proposed a number of lexical and pragmatic features which she believed to be associated with the characteristics of women's speech. Examples of these features are as follows:

1) Selection of Lexical Items: Women tend to make more precise discrimination on things, such as colors, than men do. Terms like beige, aquamarine, lavender and ecru etc. are mediocre in women's active vocabularies. However, they are absent from those of most men's.
2) Tagged-Question Formation: Tagged question is one syntactic rule that women use more frequently in conversational situations than men. It is used when a speaker is making a claim, however, lacks full confidence in how truthful the claim is. To illustrate, one may ask "John is here, isn't he?", this shows that this person biases in favor of a positive answer, wanting only confirmation by the respondent.
3) Request Instead of Order: One form of politeness in women's talk is the use of a request instead of an order. A request can be considered as a polite command. That is, it does not directly require obedience, but rather suggests something be completed as a favor to the speaker. Hence, an imperative sentence like "Close the door." is often replaced by a request or a suggestion sentence like "Will you please close the door?" by women. Although the aforementioned characteristics of women's speech features seem

convincing, Lakoff claimed that her theories were not definitive but rather intended for a starting point for future research (Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 261).

In the next section, characteristics of men's speech features, which have not been explored as much as women's (Kiesling, 2008), are reviewed.

Men's speech features. According to Scott Kiesling (2008), a sociolinguist known for his reputable published work on men's identities and language, there are certain patterns that are associated with men's language use. Examples of linguistic patterns employed by men are as follows:

1) Dominance: dominance is also one of the cultural discourses of masculinity. One way to signify that men use powerful language is that men interrupt women more in conversations. Interruption is often seen as a maneuvering for men to gain dominance over women. That is, men often prevent another party from having his/her turn to speak when they want to.
2) Competing Discourses: men employ explicitly competitive and distancing forms of language such as insults to strengthen their friendship and to foster solidarity. For example, members of a fraternity group uttered insulting speeches at each other at a rush party held to attract new members to build a sense of solidarity.
3) Men and Patterns of Language Variants: men use more variants associated with working-class speakers and lower levels of variants related to education or the standard form of language. The researchers also explained that when a variety of a language is going through a change, men tend to use lower levels of new features than women.

Regarding the men's speech features mentioned above, Kiesling (2008) claimed that not

all men will follow these patterns when compared individually. One should keep in mind that these features are not categorical differences (Kiesling, 2008, p. 668).

To conclude, just like any other area of language variation, gender-based variation is shaped by rich diversity and continual creativity. Sociolinguists will continue to explore and embrace its true complexity. (Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 261).

Prestige in Language Contact Situations

Since languages can be perceived socially as more or less superior than one another (Wolfram & Schilling, 2016, p. 174), this section will review prestige in language contact situations. According to Nordquist (2017), linguistic prestige is "the degree of esteem and social value attached by members of a speech community to certain languages, dialects, or features of a language variety." Moreover, when two languages or language varieties come into contact with each other, they are influenced by prestige to form various relationships. When the two languages do not have equal prestige, for instance, in the case of many colonial language contact situations, languages with a higher status usually manifest themselves in word borrowing. A possible effect of language contact outcome includes the formation of pidgins, and eventually creoles, when the pidgin is nativized. With the case of pidgins and creoles, often the low prestige language provides phonological systems whereas the high prestige language provides the lexicons and grammatical structures (Gutenburg, 2018).

Reality TV Shows

It is critical to examine the significance and features of reality television shows at this stage because they can be considered a community of practice formed by the people who are on these shows. Early reality television shows documented people's everyday lives while they competed for a prize, and were originally called competition-based reality television shows. The

shows usually contained an elimination process, with contestants voted off one by one until the last one was left a winner. These shows included *Survivor* and *Big Brother* in the U.S. They had massive viewerships of 50 million people of all ages and became popular in the current millennium. The success created a new genre which became mainstream in the 2000s (Andrejevic, 2004, p. 1). Their success resulted in the replacement of sitcoms and dramas, such as *Fear Factors* and *The Bachelor* during 2005-2006 (Huff, 2006).

Art and Reality

Due to a fairly large number of studies on mixed language varieties being done on naturally occurring data, this section provides justification for why I chose to collect data from semi-scripted data which can be considered unnatural to some extent. Many researchers (e.g., Rosenthal 1995 and Hill 2005, etc.) have claimed that the art forms of scripted television shows mirror humans' realities. According to Rosenthal (1995), fact and fiction are always encouraged in writing screenplays for television shows. A great number of television dramas today are based on real-life events. Screenwriters adopt real situations to write a drama around events. The extent to which these adaptations reflect reality may be gleaned from accompanying phrases such as: "a dramatic presentation having no resemblance to real personalities and events," "loosely based on," "inspired by," and "true to the spirit of." However, such phrases may be included because of legal liability, as the shows are closer to reality than purported. Nevertheless, the audiences generally see through the guise and accept the story as real. Screenwriters are encouraged to lure audience with the attraction of a real-life story, but at the same time, they want to have the total freedom of fiction (p. 200). Rosanthal (1995) also advises prospective screenwriters precisely:

> Where feasible, you stay as close to an accurate portrayal of events and happenings as you can. People want to know how this really happened, the murder, the crash of the

> Exxon Valdez, the investigation of Oppenheimer, Gandhi's salt march, the forging of Hitler's diaries – and your duty is to give them the information accurately and dramatically. What people often fail to realize is that there is a difference between truth and accuracy. You can never give the whole truth. You are selecting events and characters to give a version of the truth. (p. 201)

However, regarding reality television shows in particular, Hill (2005) states that the decision of whether contestants in reality TV shows are being truthful to the audience depends solely on the experience of the audience. He states that "The fact that reality gameshows are set up to encourage a variety of performances are viewed as 'performative' popular factual television. The manner in which ordinary people perform in different types of reality programs is subject to intense scrutiny by audiences. Inevitably, audiences draw on their own personal experience of social interaction to judge the authenticity of the way ordinary people talk, behave, and respond to situations and other people in reality programs" (p. 78).

As more Thai reality television shows with the use of Thai-English code-mixing are emerging, it is worthwhile to investigate how English codes are employed in them as well as to explore the frequency of code-mixing in each episode of the shows, each gender, and each domain of language use. The researcher also hopes that this study fills the gap in the literature of Thai-English code-mixing in Thai mass media, especially in modern reality television shows.

Research Questions

1. How is Thai-English code-mixing used in Thai reality television shows?
    - Are there any differences in frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts? if so, what are those differences?

- Are there any differences in frequency of code-mixing by mentors and contestants from the shows?

Chapter III: Methodology

This section provides an explanation of how the data was collected and how it was analyzed. Research questions of this study are as follows:

1. How is Thai-English code-mixing used in Thai reality television shows?
    - Are there any differences in frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts? if so, what are those differences?
    - Are there any differences in frequency of code-mixing by mentors and contestants from the shows?

Sources of Data

From a pool of Thai reality TV shows, two shows are selected for the analysis based on the most incidents of Thai-English code-mixing. The two shows are *The Face Thailand* season two (2015) and *The Face Men Thailand* season one (2017). These two shows were selected because they are internationally franchised modeling-themed reality TV series with multiple adaptations around the world (The U.S., The U.K., Australia, Thailand, and Vietnam). With the franchised shows being international ones, more incidents of code-mixing can be expected to be observed. Each TV series follows how three famous national coaches who are supermodels, actors/actresses, and fashion designers who mentor potential model and actor contestants to compete with each other. The last contestant left in the show will be crowned the winner and will become “the face” of a major brand. With this characteristic of the shows, the casts speak Thai throughout each episode but with some degree of code-mixing in English.

In addition, *The Face Thailand* season two and *The Face Men Thailand* season one were chosen because each one predominantly features female and male contestants respectively. This data selection is done for the purpose of investigating in the research questions as stated above.

In terms of season selection, *The Face Thailand* season two (2015) was chosen because, first, it is the only season among the three seasons in which bilinguals in the show code-mixed most frequently. Second, because this second season is fairly new, it may portray the trend of globalization more than the first season which could affect the casts' language use. Wolfram & Schilling (2016) stated that "all languages are dynamic systems undergoing constant change. Certainly, the language Shakespeare used in his plays is different from today's English, as was the English of the Elizabethan period compared to a period several centuries earlier" (p. 40). All in all, my season selection ensured that my analysis deals with quite a recent variety on the change continuum. Ultimately, *The Face Men Thailand* (2017) season one was chosen because there has not been any other season available at the time this study was conducted.

Research Materials

As mentioned in the previous section, episodes of *The Face Thailand* season two and episodes of *The Face Men Thailand* season one were used as materials in this study. Further details are provided below, in the Procedures section. These series episodes are publicly available online on Youtube.com.

Procedures

The first five episodes out of thirteen from *The Face Thailand* season two and the first five episodes out of ten from *The Face Men Thailand* season one were selected to investigate the use of Thai-English code-mixing. Data collection was also strictly limited to only bilingual individuals on each show. For *The Face Thailand* season two, the only four female bilingual individuals out of eighteen are Lukkade (mentor), Cris (mentor), Tisha (contestant), and Jessie (contestant). On the other hand, thirteen male bilingual individuals out of twenty-one are identified on *The Face Men Thailand* season one. These individuals are Moo Asava (mentor),

Peach (mentor), Phillip (contestant), Joseph (contestant), Nikki (contestant), PK (contestant), Atila (contestant), Bank (contestant), Third (contestant), Mickey (contestant), Gun (contestant), Thyme (contestant), and Jack (contestant).

The criteria used to classify bilingual from monolingual individuals on each show is based on whether each individual had received education/lived abroad where English is used as a primary language of communication or education, or is used as an official language. Another criterion is based on whether each individual had been on previously recorded media where s/he had demonstrated their English proficiency skills through speaking or writing.

In addition, English lexical items which are treated as part of Thai lexicon, and are used by Thai monolinguals extensively, are considered borrowing words, not code-mixing, and were not included in this study. The examples of these borrowing words are *okay, game, season, champion,* etc.

The researcher used a period of five minutes as a limit to collect data from each bilingual individual from each episode regardless of how long s/he speaks throughout the episode. The researcher also stopped timing when each bilingual individual stopped speaking and continued when s/he started speaking again until the five minutes were met. The raw counts through tally marks were then obtained with the number of mixes per five minutes. Subsequently, the raw data was standardized to determine how many mixes were made by each bilingual individual within one minute. This standardized data was also compared between the males and the females in order to answer the research questions regarding code-mixing by genders and roles. A simple analysis of domains of language use was also conducted and reported at the end of the research findings chapter of this study.

The standardized data was then used for further statistical analysis to compare the results

between each individual and each show. The statistical analysis adopted in this study was the independent T-Test to see whether the results were statistically significant.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was done in accordance to gender and role: male and female, mentor and contestant. The first analysis was done by comparing the standardized numbers of code-mixing per minute and per episode spoken by each female individual from *The Face Thailand* season 2. This is to examine which female individuals code-mixed less or more frequently than others. The same analysis was also done with male individuals from *The Face Men Thailand* season 1. Next, the researcher compared the standardized numbers between the male and female casts to answer the research question regarding the differences in frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts.

Further, an independent sample T-Test[2] was employed to examine whether the comparison of standardized numbers of code-mixing done by male and female casts was statistically significant. The same independent sample T-Test was also employed to investigate whether the comparison of standardized numbers of code-mixing done by mentors and contestants was statistically significant.

The last analysis involves the subject of domains of language use. This analysis was adopted to examine and compare whether there are domains of language use from both shows in which one gender code-mixes more than others. Raw count numbers of code-mixing in the three

[2] Independent Sample T-Test: an inferential statistical test that determines whether there is a statistically significant difference between the means in two unrelated groups. (“Laerd Statistics", 2018)

most frequently occurred domains, namely, employment, education and friendship, were organized in charts in order to compare the results. Nevertheless, it is critical for readers to be aware that these numbers had not been standardized based on the length of time in each domain. Therefore, the higher numbers may not indicate higher value. This is one limitation of this study which suggests future studies to systematically collect this part of data based on the length of time in each domain. The researcher also investigated a variety of factors concerning why the individuals on the shows code-mixed by employing a framework of Grosjean (1982), which includes factors such as code-switching to exclude someone from a conversation, in the discussion chapter of this study.

Chapter IV: Research Findings

This chapter presents average code-mixing incidents spoken by both female and male casts on the shows. The presentation includes the comparisons of average code-mixing incidents among the female cast and among the male cast. Comparisons of average code-mixing incidents between casts are then discussed. Further, to statistically examine which gender and role code-mixed more frequently, statistic comparisons between female and male casts, and mentors and contestants are subsequently included. Lastly, raw count numbers of code-mixing incidents by both female and male casts, categorized in three domains of language use, are presented at the end of the chapter.

Female Cast

The analysis of the data illustrated that of 18 female individuals on *The Face Thailand* season two, 15 females are contestants and the other 3 females are mentors. However, there are only 4 female bilingual individuals on the show: 2 bilinguals are mentors and the other 2 bilinguals are contestants. Lukkade and Cris are the two female bilingual mentors. Tisha and Jessie are the two female bilingual contestants. The mentors are on the show to provide lessons and training regarding entertainment business for female contestants. On the other hand, female contestants on the show compete with each other in various tasks to be the winner of the show.

As reflected in Table 1 below, in terms of the incidents of code-mixing per minute on average, Lukkade code-mixed slightly more than her fellow mentor, Cris. Lukkade's total number of code-mixing per minute is 32.4 while the total numbers of code-mixing produced by Cris is 30.2. Regarding the contestants, Tisha also code-mixed slightly more than Jessie. Tisha's total number of code-mixing per minute is 45.6 while the total numbers of code-mixing produced by Jessie is 44.2. With these numbers, it can be seen that contestants Tisha and Jessie code-

mixed more frequently than their female mentors Lukkade and Cris. More data on the number of times each female individual code-mixed in a given period of time per episode can be found in appendix A on page 81.

Table 1. Classification of average numbers of female code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Thailand,* season two

		Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 1	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 2	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 3	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 4	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 5	Total number per female individual
Mentors	Lukkade	7.2	5	4.4	6.8	9	32.4
	Cris	4.2	4.8	10.4	5.4	5.4	30.2
Contestants	Tisha	3	12	12.5	3.4	14.7	45.6
	Jessie	0	2.3	28	4	9.9	44.2
Total number per episode		14.4	24.1	55.3	19.6	39	

As reflected in Table 1 above, Tisha is the only female cast who code-mixed the most frequently (45.6) throughout the five selected episodes of *The Face Thailand* season two. This also indicates that Cris code-mixed the least frequently (30.2) throughout the selected five episodes. Regarding each episode, the highest incidents of code-mixing take place in episode three (55.3), five (39), two (24.1), four (19.6) and one (14.4), respectively.

Examples of code-mixing incidents spoken by mentors Lukkade and Cris can be seen from (4) and (5) respectively.

(4) **พี่ สูง กว่า** **พี่ เดินแบบ** **พี่ เป็น** supermodel **พี่ เล่น ละคร มา**

Phi soong kwa phi dernbab phi bhen supermodel phi len lakorn ma

I tall comparative I walk runway I am supermodel I act drama past

‘ I am taller. I walk runways. I am a supermodel. I have acted in drama series before.’

This incidence of code-mixing occurred when mentor Lukkade was talking to one of the female contestants. She was persuading her to choose to be on her team by presenting herself as a more experienced individual than other mentors. She code-mixed at the lexical level by using the English lexeme *supermodel* when she could have used a Thai lexeme for it in a Thai sentence.

(5) **คริส ว่า มัน ก็ มี** flaw **ตรงนี้**

Cris wa man kor mee flaw trongnee

Cris thinks it interjection has flaw right here

'I think she has a flaw right here.'

This incidence of code-mixing occurred when mentor Cris was talking to her fellow female mentors. She was critiquing on one of the female contestants' facial features. She code-mixed at the lexical level by using the English lexeme *flaw* in a Thai sentence.

Examples of code-mixing incidents spoken by contestants Tisha and Jessie can be seen from (6) and (7) respectively.

(6) **ถือว่า เป็น อะไร ที่** essential **ของ เกม นี้ เลย**

Teuwa bhen arai tee essential khong game nee loey

Consider is what that essential of game this particle

'This is what is essential for this game.'

Example (6) above illustrates Tisha giving her thoughts on a photoshoot lesson given by one of the mentors. She code-mixed at a lexical level with the English lexeme *essential*.

(7) นี่ คือ acting หรือ มัน ไม่ make sense

Nee kuea acting ruea man mai make sense

This is acting question particle it not make sense

'This is acting? It does not make sense.'

Example (7) above shows that Jessie code-mixed at both lexical and phrasal level. She was giving a comment on one of the mentors. She was feeling upset because that mentor was not being sincere to her. She felt as if she was being blindsided in the competition.

Male Cast

As for the male cast, the analysis of the data illustrated that of 20 male individuals on *The Face Men Thailand* season one, 18 males are contestants and the other 2 males are mentors. However, there are 13 male bilingual individuals on the show: 2 bilinguals are mentors and the other 11 bilinguals are contestants. Moo Asava and Peach are the two male bilingual mentors. Phillip, Joseph, Nikki, PK, Atilla, Bank, Third, Mickey, Gun, Thyme and Jack are the eleven male bilingual contestants. The mentors are on the show to provide lessons and training regarding entertainment business for male contestants. On the other hand, male contestants on the show compete each other in various tasks to be the winner of the show.

As reflected in Table 2 below, in terms of the incidents of code-mixing per minute on average, Moo Asava code-mixed more than his fellow mentor, Peach. Moo Asava's total number of code-mixing per minute is 69.2 while the total numbers of code-mixing produced by Peach is 45.9. Regarding the contestants, 11 male contestants' total numbers of code-mixing are quite low. However, one contestant, PK, has the highest total number of code-mixing (55) compared to his fellow contestants. His total is also even higher than that of mentor Peach. With these numbers, it can be seen the eleven male contestants code-mixed much less frequently than their

two mentors. More data on the number of times each male individual code-mixed in a given period of time per episode can be found in appendix B on page 83.

Table 2. Classification of average numbers of male code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Men Thailand*, season one

		Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 1	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 2	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 3	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 4	Average Number of Code-Mixing per minute in Episode 5	Total number per individual
Mentors	Moo Asava	14.8	14.2	12.2	16.2	11.8	69.2
	Peach	12	8.2	5.4	8.3	12	45.9
Contest-ants	PK	12	4	6	9	24	55
	Third	0	6	3	20	3	32
	Bank	0	5	4	10	5	24
	Jack	7	2	2	3	2	16
	Mickey	2	0	1	6	6	15
	Joseph	4	0	1	9	0	14
	Thyme	0	2	1	4	2	9
	Phillip	6	2	0	0	0	8
	Nikki	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Gun	2	0	0	0	0	2
	Atilla	1	0	0	0	0	1
Total number per episode		60.8	43.4	37.6	85.5	65.8	

As reflected in Table 2 above, it was found that Moo Asava is the one male individual on the show who code-mixed the most frequently throughout the selected five episodes compared to the other cast members. Peach also code-mixed quite frequently. His total average number of code-mixing (45.9) is higher than all the male contestants, except for when comparing to PK's (55). Examples of code-mixing incidents spoken by mentor Peach and contestant PK can be seen from (8) and (9) respectively.

(8) **อาชีพ เรา ก็ มี** value **เยอะอยู่**

Archeeb rao kor mee value yeryoo

Profession our particle has value much

‘Our profession has a great value.’

This incidence of code-mixing (8) occurred when mentor Peach was talking to one of the male contestants who were in the process of competing to be on the show. The male contestant told Peach that his dream career is to become a plane pilot. Therefore, Peach told him that he should follow his dream and not be on the show. Peach stated that his career has a great value and that he wants people who are very passionate to have it instead. Peach code-mixed at a lexical-level by using the English lexeme *value* in a Thai sentence.

(9) Energy **ของ ผม กับ แมน** synchronize **กัน**

Energy kong phom kab Man synchronize **กัน**

Energy of me and Man synchronize together

‘My energy and Man’s energy synchronize.’

Example (9) illustrates the use of code-mixing by contestant PK. He was giving his thoughts in one of the confessional sections on how he can get along with the other male contestant, Man. He code-mixed at the lexical level by using English lexemes *energy* and *synchronize*.

Among the contestants, the top five people who code-mixed the most frequently are PK (55), Third (32), Bank (24), Jack (16) and Mickey (15). The top five contestants who code-mixed the least are Atilla (1), Nikki (2), Gun (2), Phillip (8), and Joseph (14). When focusing on each episode, the highest incidents of code-mixing take place in episode four (85.5), five (65.8), one (60.8), two (43.4) and three (37.6), respectively.

Comparison of Female Cast and Male Cast

As reflected in Table 3 below, it was observed that both male mentors, Moo and Peach, code-mixed more than both female mentors, Lukkade and Cris, on average per minute. Moo's and Peach's total numbers of code-mixing per minute are 69.2 and 45.9 respectively while Lukkade's and Cris' are only 32.4 and 30.2 respectively. Moreover, it can be said that the sum of male mentors' numbers (115.1) is more than the sum of the female mentors (62.6). Therefore, male mentors code-mixed more than female mentors by a greater extent.

Table 3. Comparison of female and male mentors code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Thailand*, season two, and *The Face Men Thailand*, season one

		Total average number of code-mixing in Ep1-Ep5 of each show per each mentor	Sum of mentors' average code-mixing numbers per each show/gender
Female Mentors	Lukkade	32.4	62.6
	Cris	30.2	
Male Mentors	Moo Asava	69.2	115.1
	Peach	45.9	

In contrast, examining the contestants' linguistic behavior in Table 4 below, it is determined that male contestants in general rarely code-mixed when compared to female contestants. Almost all male contestants have less numbers of code-mixing per minute throughout the selected five episodes compared to the female ones (Tisha = 45.6, Jessie = 44.2). However, only one male contestant, PK, has a higher average number of code-mixing throughout the selected five episodes than the female contestants. He code-mixed on average 55 times per minute.

Table 4. Comparison of female and male contestants code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Thailand*, season two, and *The Face Men Thailand*, season one

		Total average number of code-mixing in Ep1-Ep5 of each show per each contestant
Female Contestants	Tisha	45.6
	Jessie	44.2
Male Contestants	PK	55
	Third	32
	Bank	24
	Jack	16
	Mickey	15
	Joseph	14
	Thyme	9
	Phillip	8
	Nikki	2
	Gun	2
	Atilla	1

As reflected in Table 5 below, comparing male contestants to female mentors, only two male contestants, PK (55) and Third (32), have higher and almost equivalent numbers of code-mixing per minute than the female mentors, Lukkade (32.4) and Cris (30.2).

Table 5. Comparison of male contestants and female mentors code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Thailand*, season two, and *The Face Men Thailand*, season one

		Total average number of code-mixing in Ep1-Ep5 of each show per each individual
Male Contestants	PK	55
	Third	32
Female Mentors	Lukkade	32.4
	Cris	30.2

Similarly, as reflected in Table 6 below, comparing male mentors to female contestants, two male mentors, Moo (69.2) and Peach (45.9), have higher and almost equivalent numbers of code-mixing per minute than the female contestants, Tisha (45.6) and Jessie (44.2).

Table 6. Comparison of male mentors and female contestants code-mixing per minute in each episode (1-5) for *The Face Thailand,* season two, and *The Face Men Thailand,* season one

		Total average number of code-mixing in Ep1-Ep5 of each show per each individual
Male Mentors	Moo Asava	69.2
	Peach	45.9
Female Contestants	Tisha	45.6
	Jessie	44.2

Statistic Comparison Between Female and Male Casts

In an attempt to investigate the difference in statistics between the male and female casts, and between mentors and contestants, two independent sample T-Tests were employed to determine whether any differences observed are statistically significant. In this section, the presentation of the statistical analysis is in the following order: statistical test of female and male casts, and statistical test of mentors and contestants.

Statistical test of female and male casts. As can be observed in Table 7 below, the mean values of male and female casts are quite different (each cast includes both mentors and contestants). The male casts' mean value is 4.509 while the female's mean value is almost twice as much, which is 7.620. This means that, at first glance, female cast code-mixed more frequently than male cast. However, independent samples T-Test ($t=-1.368$ [15], $p>.05$) showed that the difference between the two groups' means was statistically insignificant. This indicates

that the likelihood of female cast code-mixing more frequently than male cast will not be likely to replicate in future studies. This result may be due to the dramatically uneven size sample of male and female casts, which is 13 and 4 respectively.

Table 7. Group statistics for average count per minute of code-mixing by gender

Gender	N (Number of Subject)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Female Cast	4	7.620	1.5848
Male Cast	13	4.509	4.3754

Statistical test of mentors and contestants. In addition to the statistical difference between the male and female casts, the difference in statistics between mentors and contestants was also investigated to see whether this difference is statistically significant. As can be observed in Table 8 below, the mean values of mentors and contestants are quite different (each role includes both female and male individuals). This value indicates that mentors code-mixed more frequently than contestants. The contestants' mean value is 4.120 while the mentors' mean value is approximately twice as much, which is 8.885. Furthermore, independent samples T-Test ($t=2.297$ [15], $p<.05$) showed that the difference between the two groups' means was statistically significant. This indicates that the likelihood of mentors code-mixing more frequently than contestants will likely be replicated in future studies. This may be due to the notion that mentors' responsibilities include giving advice and orders, and their statuses as celebrities. They have more opportunities than the contestants to speak on the shows.

Table 8. Group statistics for average count per minute of code-mixing by role

Role	N (Number of Subject)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Mentor	4	8.885	3.5832
Contestant	13	4.120	3.6388

This current section has answered my research questions. There are differences in frequency of code-mixing between male and female casts, and between mentors and contestants. In addition, the researcher will touch upon the topic of domains of language which has emerged from the data collected from the shows in the next section.

Domains of Language Use

This subsection deals with the incident numbers of code-mixing by both male and female casts categorized in different domains of language use. Three prominent domains of language use which emerged from code-mixing incidents spoken by both casts are as follow: employment, education and friendship. The presentation of this subsection begins with female and male casts' raw count numbers of code-mixing incidents categorized in different domains of language use. Subsequently, female and male casts' raw count numbers of code-mixing incidents from each episode (1-5), categorized in different domains of language use, are illustrated.

Table 9 below illustrates the raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing incidents categorized in three domains of language use by female casts. The raw counts numbers are collected from episode 1-5 of *The Face Thailand*, season two.

Table 9. Raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing incidents in three domains of language use by female cast

		Employment Domain (raw count and percentage)		Education Domain (raw count and percentage)		Friendship Domain (raw count and percentage)	
Mentors	Lukkade	120	96%	17	100%	15	26.4%
	Cris	81		67		8	
Contestants	Tisha	4	3.3%	0	0%	38	73.5%
	Jessie	3		0		26	
Total number of raw counts per domain		208		84		87	

The numbers shown in Table 9 can be misleading because they have not been standardized based on the length of time. Therefore, higher numbers may not indicate higher value. This is one limitation of this study that the researcher would like to point out. Future studies on this topic may need to look into the duration and the speed of each individual's speech. Nevertheless, regarding the raw count numbers, it can be observed that the bilingual female individuals code-mixed most frequently in employment domain with the raw count of 208 times. Within 208 times of code-mixing in the employment domain, the mentors code-mixed 96.6% while the contestants code-mixed 3.3%. The difference is 92.7%, which indicates that mentors code-mixed more frequently than contestants by a great deal in the employment domain.

The next domain that code-mixing incidents took place in is friendship domain, with the raw count number of 87 times. Within 87 times of code-mixing in the friendship domain, the contestants code-mixed 73.5% while the mentors code-mixed 26.4%. The difference is 47.1%, which indicates that the contestants code-mixed more than the mentors in the friendship domain.

The last domain that code-mixing appeared in the least is education domain. It has the total raw count numbers of 84. The mentors code-mixed 87 times or 100% while the contestants did not code-mix at all in this domain.

Table 10 below illustrates the raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing incidents categorized in three domains of language use by male casts. These raw counts numbers are collected from episode 1-5 of *The Face Men Thailand*, season one.

Table 10. Raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing incidents in three domains of language use by male cast

		Employment Domain (raw count and percentage)		Education Domain (raw count and percentage)		Friendship Domain (raw count and percentage)	
Mentors	Moo Asava	211	79.2%	97	100%	15	16.8%
	Peach	121		43		4	
Contestants	Bank	24	20.7%	0	0%	3	83.1%
	PK	20		0		35	
	Third	9		0		23	
	Mickey	9		0		6	
	Thyme	8		0		1	
	Joseph	7		0		7	
	Jack	6		0		10	
	Phillip	2		0		6	
	Gun	2		0		0	
	Nikki	0		0		2	
	Atilla	0		0		1	
Total number per domain		419		140		113	

As reflected in Table 10, similarly to the raw count numbers of code-mixing incidents spoken by the female cast in three domains of language use, male casts' raw count numbers may be as misleading as well. This is because they have not been standardized based on the length of time. Therefore, higher numbers may not indicate higher value. However, based on the raw count numbers of male individuals, it can be observed that the bilingual male individuals code-mixed most frequently in the employment domain like the female cast with the raw count of 419 times. Within 419 times of code-mixing in the employment domain, the mentors code-mixed 79.2% whereas the contestants code-mixed 20.7%. The difference is 58.5%, which indicates that mentors code-mixed more frequently than contestants in the employment domain.

The next domain that code-mixing took place in is education domain, with the raw count

number of 140 times. Within 140 times of code-mixing in the education domain, the contestants did not code-mix at all. Only the mentors code-mixed within that 140 times. Thus, the mentors code-mix more than the contestants in the education domain.

The last domain that code-mixing appeared in the least is friendship domain. It has the total raw count numbers of 113. The mentors code-mixed only 16.8% whereas the contestants did 83.1%. Therefore, it can be said that the male contestants code-mixed more than the male mentors in the friendship domain.

As reflected in Table 11 below, when comparing the two genders, it is clear that the female cast code-mixed most frequently in the order of employment domain, friendship domain and education domain. On the other hand, male cast code-mixed most frequently in the order of employment domain, education domain, and friendship domain. However, again, readers need to be aware that these numbers may be misleading because they have not been standardized based on the length of time.

Table 11. Total raw count numbers of code-mixing incidents in three domains of language use by both female and male casts

Employment Domain		Education Domain		Friendship Domain	
Female Cast	Male Cast	Female Cast	Male Cast	Female Cast	Male Cast
208	419	84	140	87	113

Table 12 below presents the total raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing in the three domains from each episode by female cast.

Table 12. Total raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing incidents in the three domains from each episode by female cast.

Episode Number	Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in employment domain		Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in education domain		Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in friendship domain	
	Raw counts	Percentage	Raw counts	Percentage	Raw counts	Percentage
Episode 1	48	23%	0	0%	20	19%
Episode 2	31	14%	7	8%	10	11%
Episode 3	36	17%	40	47%	29	33%
Episode 4	41	20%	20	23%	4	5%
Episode 5	52	25%	17	20%	24	28%
Total raw counts per domain	208		84		87	
Average raw count and percentage per episode	41.6 (54%)		16.8 (22%)		17.4 (23%)	

As reflected in Table 12, it can be observed that the most incidents of code-mixing spoken by female cast took place in employment domain, with the highest number of incidents in episode 5, which is 52, or 25% of all 5 episodes combined. In addition, no incident of code-mixing in education domain was found in episode 1. Regarding the average raw count numbers of code-mixing, female casts code-mixed on average 41.6 times per episode (54%) in employment domain, 16.8 times per episode (22%) in education domain and 17.4 times per episode (23%) in friendship domain.

Table 13 below shows the total raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing in the three domains from each episode by male casts.

Table 13. Total raw count numbers and percentages of code-mixing in the three domains from each episode by male cast.

Episode Number	Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in employment domain		Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in education domain		Total raw count and percentage of code-mixing in friendship domain	
	Raw counts	Percentage	Raw counts	Percentage	Raw counts	Percentage
Episode 1	96	23%	15	11%	37	32%
Episode 2	90	21%	40	29%	6	5%
Episode 3	53	13%	32	23%	17	15%
Episode 4	107	26%	16	11%	23	20%
Episode 5	73	17%	37	26%	30	27%
Total raw counts per domain	419		140		113	
Average raw count and percentage per episode	83.8 (62%)		28 (21%)		22.6 (17%)	

As reflected in table 13, the most incidents of code-mixing produced by male cast took place in employment domain, with the highest number of incidents in episode 4, which is 107 or 26% of all 5 episodes combined. In addition, in episode 2, only 6 incidents (5%) of code-mixing in friendship domain were found. Regarding the average raw count numbers of code-mixing, male cast code-mixed on average 83.8 times per episode (62%) in employment domain, 28 times per episode (21%) in education domain and 22.6 times per episode (17%) in friendship domain. These numbers are all higher than the female casts'. However, as previously mentioned earlier, readers need to be aware that these numbers may be misleading because they have not been standardized based on the length of time.

Returning to the purpose of this study, which is to investigate how code-mixing is adopted in the two selected Thai competition reality TV shows, the results illustrated there are differences in the frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts. Overall, the female cast

code-mixed more frequently than the male cast. However, this result is statistically insignificant. In terms of roles, both male and female mentors code-mixed more than the contestants of both genders; this result is statistically significant. In the next chapter, the researcher discussed a variety of theories in the fields of code-switching, sociolinguistics, and other possible reasoning which may support the results found in the current chapter.

Chapter V: Discussions

This chapter emphasizes on the discussions of various factors which may explain the results presented in the research findings chapter. The order of the discussions in this chapter will be as follows: cast gender and code-mixing frequency, community of practice (Thai modeling reality television shows), role and code-mixing frequency, female cast's patterns of code-mixing, and male cast's patterns of code-mixing.

Cast Gender and Code-Mixing Frequency

Regarding whether there are differences in frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts, the statistical results have yielded that there is a difference. As reflected in the mean column in Table 7, at first glance, the numbers are quite different, signifying that female cast code-mixed more frequently than their counterpart group. However, regarding the independent sample T-test result ($t=-1.368$ [15], $p>.05$), it can be observed that the aforementioned difference is not statistically significant. This is mainly because of the drastically uneven sample size of the male and female casts. There are only 4 bilinguals in the female cast group while the male cast has a total of 13 bilinguals.

When considering the claims made by multiple researchers (Trudgil, 1972; Shuy, Wolfram & Riley, 1967; Kiesling, 1998; Kiesling, 2008) regarding how women use more standard and less vernacular forms of language more than men, my data collection demonstrated quite the opposite, if we consider code-mixing non-standard or vernacular. My results indicated that women code-mixed, more than men by almost twice as much. I believe this phenomenon is intriguing and worthwhile to discuss for a number of reasons.

First, the non-conforming result may be due to the several features of the shows. Because the content of the shows revolves around the modeling and international fashion trends which are

mostly westernized and predominantly female industries, the female cast may have more needs than the male cast to code-mix with Thai and English. Moreover, modeling and fashion industries in Thailand are highly associated with female and gay male individuals from a higher socio-economic class. They are usually educated and bilinguals, so they are capable of using their English skills very well.

Second, modeling and fashion industries in Thailand are often perceived with expensive and glamorous western trends which come with the usage of English language and other western languages in high-end brand names and advertisement. This notion supports one cultural value in Thailand, a monolingual country, that English is equivalent to a prestigious language. For instance, Thai people who are capable of demonstrating a good use of English with less Thai accent are usually perceived as people from higher socio-economic classes.

My study on the phenomenon of the female cast code-mixing more than the male cast may contradict with the theory raised by Trudgil (1972), which he claimed that women use language forms that are associated with the prestige standard more than men (p. 179). However, one needs to note that if code-mixed forms mirror patterns observed and reported in monolingual communities, the proposition will need further investigation. Trudgil (1972) also made a claim which may have been true in monolingual communities of the 1970's. Nonetheless, I addressed his claim in regards to how one would argue his claim from a modernized perspective toward the end of this subsection. His claim is as follows:

> Men in our society can be rated socially by their occupation, their earning power, and perhaps by their other abilities – in other words by what they *do*. For the most part, however, this is not possible for women. It may be, therefore, that they have instead to be rated on how they *appear*. Since they are not rated by their occupation or by their

> occupational success, other signals of status, including speech, are correspondingly more important (p. 183).

Trudgil's (1972) claim above is in agreement with Kiesling's (2007) findings which showed that men generally employ higher usage of language variants associated with working-class speakers than women. Moreover, men also employ lower usage of language variants associated with education or the standard form of language. Nevertheless, Kiesling (2007) pointed that his findings cannot always be applied to all men and women. There are many other men and women who will not follow the aforementioned patterns when compared individually (p. 668).

One more factor that I would like to point out is the issue of time period. Trudgil's research was conducted in 1972 which is nearly five decades ago. I believe it is highly possible that the cultural value for women and men has changed over time. The concept of gender egalitarianism is becoming more prominent in Thailand in the present days. In fact, as revealed in the Grand Thornton's annual survey of senior management roles held by women in 36 countries, Thailand was ranked third (31%), after Indonesia (46%) and the Philippines (40%) in the Asia Pacific for the ratio of women in senior management positions of 35 countries surveyed in 2017 (Thai PBS, 2017). Therefore, I believe that women nowadays can be socially rated through professional success and earning power as much as men are.

Nevertheless, according to Cheshire and Gardner-Chloros (1998), there is a degree of inconsistency between the pattern of sex differentiation and the use of standard/non-standard form of language from both monolingual and bilingual societies (p. 28). Thus, I will discuss the concept Community of Practice mentioned in section 2.10 in the following section.

Community of Practice (Thai Modeling Reality Television Shows)

As mentioned in chapter two, literature review (section 2.10), the issue of language and gender may not be sufficient to explain the phenomenon why the female cast employed non-standard form of language (code-mixing) more frequently in the current study. The theory of Community of Practice should be taken into account to examine the phenomenon. To illustrate, the realm of westernized modeling Thai reality television shows can be considered a community of practice for both the female and male casts. Within this community of practice, it is highly possible that the term *standard forms of language* mentioned in the previous section (5.1) is not fixed. The concept of *standard forms of language* may be variable to different communities. To the community of Thai reality television shows, Thai-English code-mixing may be the norm or the standard form of language which may explain the results why both the female and male casts on the shows code-mixed. To conclude, the female and male casts code-mixed because they may share the same practice, common interests, or positions as other individuals in the community of Thai modeling reality television shows, and in this community of practice, once again, perhaps the mixed form is the "standard". Again, further studies will have to verify this claim.

Role and Code-Mixing Frequency

Regarding whether there are any differences of code-mixing between mentors and contestants, my results illustrate that there is a difference. Mentors do code-mix on the show more than their contestants. The significance of this difference was also supported by the T-test, which means that this pattern of code-mixing by mentors and contestants will likely be replicated in future studies. I believe the main reason that mentors code-mix more frequently is because of their celebrity statuses. These mentors are national fashion supermodel, fashion designer, actor, actress, and singer, who have been in the industry for a fairly long period of time. One way to

show their expertise is through the use of English lexemes in their speech because English language in Thailand signifies prestige (Nordquist, 2017). It can also convey power and elite social class which are often associated with celebrityhood in general. Additionally, because of their celebrity statuses as qualifications to be on these shows as mentors, they are treated as teachers to the contestants. Thus, they are provided with more time than the contestants to speak on the show, allowing for more incidents of code-mixing to occur.

Despite the practice of code-mixing by the male and female casts, which is usually frowned-upon in Thai society, the shows are still gaining popularity and are still airing their latest seasons (All-Star season) up to the present days. I believe this is also because times have changed, and that the younger Thai generation may have more positive attitudes towards code-mixing[3]. It may also be because they have much better and higher education than the older Thai generations as well. To illustrate, my mother, a middle-aged Thai monolingual, always complains that there is an excessive amount of code-mixing in the shows and that Thai subtitles are always needed for people similar to her age and education level to understand. Nevertheless, based on my informal survey I conducted with my Thai peers, they said unanimously that the shows are very enjoyable and they had no trouble understanding the use of Thai-English code-mixing adopting on the shows.

The next section specifically discusses how the female cast employed the use of Thai-English code-mixing in further detail.

Female Cast

This subsection features discussions about the occasion that the female cast code-mixed

[3] This hypothesis will need to be confirmed by future studies.

frequently in, rare code-mixing pattern within the female cast, and their other code-mixing patterns such as code-mixing in negative sentences, code-mixing to give directions, and code-mixing to utter sarcastic statements. Subsequently, discussions about potential factors influencing them to code-mix, and their choices of English code-mixing lexemes in the three domains of language use are included.

Female cast's code-mixing and occasion. In each episode of the show, there are multiple sections called "confessional" during which female individuals state their opinions to the audience regarding their mentors, contestants, and their performances on each weekly task, etc. Their opinions can be both positive and negative. Focusing on the use of Thai-English code-mixing among the female cast, they code-mixed more frequently when they gave their thoughts or opinions during these confessional sections. An example from a contestant, Tisha, expressing her thoughts on a weekly task during one of her confessional sections can be observed in (10):

(10): **หนู ไม่ ถ่าย** selfie **หนึ่ง นาที มัน** impossible **ต้อง พยายาม ทำ หน้า ให้** perfect

Noo mai tai selfie neung natee man impossible tong payayam tam nar hai perfect

I no take selfie one minute it impossible must try make face be perfect

'I do not take selfies within one minute. It is impossible to make a perfect face.'

Another example of a female mentor, Cris, expressing her opinion on her mentees during one of her confessional sections can be observed in (11):

(11): Team **เรา มัน** strong **มาก**

Team rao man strong mark

Team our it strong very much

'Our team is very strong.'

Examples (10) and (11) represent the kinds of statements/comments with Thai-English

code-mixing spoken by female cast in multiple confessional sections of the show.

Rare pattern within female cast. While most mixed varieties observed in this investigation were on the lexical level, one female contestant, Tisha, adopted the practice of code-mixing in a different way, which is an aberration from the rest of the female cast. Tisha code-mixed in a way that is rare compared to how other female mentors and contestants would do on the show. That is, she code-mixed more frequently at the clausal level, not at lexical level like other female individuals[4]. Two examples of Tisha's unique patterns can be observed in (12) and (13) below:

(12): **สำหรับ ผู้เข้าแข่งขัน คนอื่นๆ นะคะ** watch out **นะคะ เพราะ** I'll be the Face Thailand.

Samrab pukaokangkan koneuneun naka watch out naka pror I'll be the Face Thailand.

For contestants other particle watch out particle because I'll be the Face Thailand

'Other contestants should watch out for themselves because I'll be the Face Thailand.'

(13): **ติช่า อยากได้ มัน มากๆ แล้ว ติช่า ก็มี** potential so much in me you haven't seen.

My whole body and soul want this. I want this so bad.

Tisha yarkdai man makmak laew Tisha kormee potential so much in me you haven't seen.

My whole body and soul want this. I want this so bad.

Tisha want it a lot and Tisha has potential so much in me you haven't seen.

My whole body and soul want this. I want this so bad.

'I really want it and I have so much potential in me you haven't seen. My whole body and soul want this. I want this so bad.'

It may be that Tisha code-mixed more frequently at the clausal level compared to other

[4] Male contestant, Third, also presents a similar code-mixing pattern like Tisha's. Third will be discussed more in further details in the section 5.4.2 Rare Pattern within Male Cast.

female individuals on the show because of her background. She mentioned at the beginning of the show that she flew directly from her hometown, Sweden, only to be casted for this realty TV show. This means that she grew up in Sweden and may not be aware of how code-mixing is usually adopted in Thailand. One other possible reason is that she may be more skillful in English and may feel more comfortable using English than other female individuals on the show.

Female cast's code-mixing patterns. The discussion of the female cast's code-mixing patterns is in the following order: code-mixing to give orders, code-mixing to utter negative statements, and code-mixing to utter sarcastic statements.

One code-mixing pattern that can be observed from the data is that the usage of code-mixing is usually adopted more frequently when the mentors on the show gave orders or directions with imperative sentences. These imperative sentences are usually uttered in order to direct the mentees. Examples of female mentor, Lukkade, code-mixing to give an order/direction can be seen in (14) below.

(14) **อ่ะ** **ขอ** strong **ขนลุก** **ละ** **นะ**

Ar kor strong khonlook la na

particle give strong goosebumps PAST particle

'Ah, give me a strong look. I just got goosebumps.'

As reflected in (14), mentor Lukkade is directing her team in a fashion photoshoot. She code-mixed at the lexical level to give directions to her mentees. She is telling her mentees to pose with a strong posture for the photographer in the example.

In addition, the researcher also found that female cast code-mixed more frequently in negative statements. These negative statements sometimes imply a sense of sarcasm. They are mostly uttered by mentors to their rival mentors. Examples of female mentor, Lukkade, code-

mixing to utter a negative statement can be seen from (15) below:

(15): **ติช่า อ่ะ** acting **ดี นะ** **แต่ หน้า เค้า ไม่ แพง**

Tisha ah acting dee na tae na kao mai pang

Tisha particle acting good particle but face her not expensive

'For Tisha, her acting is good but her face does not look classy.'

Example (15) above shows that mentor Lukkade is giving a negative comment toward a contestant from her fellow mentor's team. Lukkade simply implied with Thai-English code-mixing that the contestant from her team have a classy facial appearance.

Example of female mentor, Cris, and contestant, Jessie, code-mix to utter sarcastic statements can be seen below from (16) and (17) respectively:

(16): **พี่ หา** Survivor **หรือ หา** The Face **คะ** (Cris talking to Lukkade)

Phi ha Survivor rue ha The Face ka

You search Survivor or search The Face question particle

'Are you looking for a Survivor or The Face?'

Example (16) above shows that mentor Cris is not satisfied about the way mentor Lukkade is managing her strategies for her contestants. Therefore, mentor Cris code-mixed in a negative statement with sarcasm to show her dissatisfaction. By uttering "Survivor", mentor Cris implied that the winner of the show has to be physically strong as if s/he is from the other reality TV show "*Survivor*", which is not the goal of the current show. (17) below is a sarcastic statement uttered by contestant Jessie.

(17): **พี่ ลูกเกด ไป ขอบคุณ ไป** thank you **พี่ บี ไม่ จำเป็น ป๊ะ**

Phi Lukkade pai khobkhun pai thank you phi Bee mai jambhen pa

Sister Lukkade go thank go thank sister Bee not necessary question particle

‘Mentor Lukkade went to thank mentor Bee, is that necessary?’

Example (17) above illustrates that Jessie feels annoyed that mentor Lukkade and mentor Bee are working together to keep voting more contestants from her team out of the competition. Therefore, she code-mixed in a sarcastic statement to show her annoyance.

Based on (14) to (17), the theories raised by François Grosjean (1982) can be observed. The factors influencing the mentors to code-mix when giving directions and orders to their mentees is to change the role of speakers; whether it be to raise status, add authority or to show expertise. Furthermore, the mentors may have the need to add authority, and to raise their status above the contestants to draw their attention. Regarding code-mixing with sarcastic statements, one factor proposed by Grosjean (1982) is that people code-switch/mix when they feel annoyed which applies to when some of the female individuals on the show feel annoyed by their opponents.

Female cast’s code-mixing lexemes in domains of language use. Regarding the domain of language use raw count results in the previous chapter, female mentors code-mixed more frequently than their mentees (contestants) in the employment domain. Furthermore, when investigating the code-mixed constructions within that domain, I can report that most of the English vocabularies are nouns, adjectives, and verbs respectively. Noun Phrases (NPs) used by mentors include vocabularies which are related to fashion and modeling industry-related tasks such as *supermodel, persona, challenge, campaign, make-over, acting, red carpet, sex appeal, potential, flaw, attitude, photoshoot, beauty shot, fashion show*, etc. These NPs were usually used within the context of modeling-related tasks that the contestants had to perform and compete such as in photoshoots, and in a TV commercial advertisement production tasks. Only a few of the nouns found were employed within the context of getting a career. Therefore, the

employment domain in this case refers to fashion and modeling-related terms adopted within the weekly tasks on the shows. However, adjectives used by the mentors were to describe how well or poorly each contestant performed in certain tasks. They are also mostly used to describe the difficulty of each weekly task presented on each episode as well. Examples of these adjectives are *outstanding, sexy, strong, clean, powerful, mature*, etc.

In terms of female contestants, raw counts illustrate that they code-mixed more frequently in the friendship domain than in employment and education domains. When examining the code-mixing vocabularies within the friendship domain, most of the English vocabularies are verbs, nouns, and adjectives respectively. Contestants also showed more incidents of code-mixing at the clausal level. Verbs used by the contestants include *care, disagree, coach, build, plan,* etc. These verbs were usually used within the context of contestants talking to one another in the friendship domain. The subjects in their conversation can vary from episode to episode. Nevertheless, nouns used by the contestants were to discuss fashion and modeling industry-related tasks like how their mentors used. Moreover, adjectives were mostly used to describe the personalities and traits of their fellow contestants and their mentors. Examples of these nouns and adjectives are *competition, acting, character, lesbian, high school, fake, perfect, impossible, professional,* etc.

Considering the timeframe of the five episodes of the show, Jessie and Lukkade displayed a fluctuating pattern of code-mixing over the course of time. Lukkade code-mixed a great deal in the first episode. Then, her numbers began to drop in the second and third episode. It peaked in the fifth episode with the highest number compared to her previous numbers. However, Jessie has no incidents of code-mixing at all in the first episode. Then, her numbers began to increase until it peaked in the third episode and dropped to a much lower number in the

fourth episode. Meanwhile, Cris and Tisha have quite the same number of code-mixing throughout the five episodes. I believe the reason that Lukkade code-mixed more at the beginning of the show is because of her status. She is a mentor and a famous Thai supermodel. Therefore, the show may want to capture her more and may want to provide more time for her to speak whereas Jessie, a newcomer contestant who has not been born in the industry yet, was given only a short period of time (about one minute) to talk on the show. This is also because of the big number of contestants being on the show. The show producer must have provided the time for all 15 contestants to speak equally within one episode.

To conclude, this subsection has shown that the female cast employed a code-mixed variety, which can be considered the non-standard form in the larger Thai language context, but may be regarded as the norm within this particular community of modeling reality television shows. A variety of code-mixing patterns as well as the factors influencing them to code-mix also emerged from the way they code-mixed. Equally important, since the westernized reality television show *The Face Thailand* season two is a community of practice for the female cast, Thai-English code-mixing may be the expected form of language to be uttered by the female bilingual individuals.

The next section specifically discusses how the male cast employed the use of Thai-English code-mixing in further detail.

Male Cast

This subsection features discussions about the occasion that the male cast frequently code-mixed in, one rare code-mixing pattern within the male cast, and their other code-mixing patterns such as code-mixing in positive sentences, code-mixing to show expertise, and code-mixing to challenge someone. Subsequently, discussions about potential factors influencing them

to code-mix, and their choices of English code-mixing lexemes in the three domains of language use are included.

Male cast's code-mixing and occasion. Emphasizing on the use of Thai-English code-mixing among the male cast, unlike female cast, they code-mixed more frequently when they had conversations with each other. The conversations usually took place when the mentors gave directions to their mentees about weekly tasks that they had to perform. The meeting conversations featured both the mentor and the mentees of each team choosing one person in their own team who performed the most poorly in each weekly task. The chosen person would be likely to be eliminated from the team later. The male cast's conversations can be in both positive and negative sentences. An example of mentor Moo Asava, expressing his thoughts in a group meeting about the difficulty of the first weekly task when he was on a photoshoot set can be observed in (18).

(18): แค่ week แรก ก็ จะ อ้วก

Kae week raek kor ja aauk

Just week first [topic marker] will vomit

'Just this first week already makes me want to vomit'

Example (18) above illustrates that mentor Moo Asava feels overwhelmed with the difficulty of the first weekly task when he was on a photoshoot set. He felt that it was very difficult to the point that he felt sick.

Rare pattern within male cast. Regarding the male cast data, one male contestant, Third, adopted the practice of code-mixing in a different way, which is an aberration from the rest of the male cast. Third code-mixed in a way that is rare compared to how other male mentors and contestants would do on the show. Like Tisha (see section 5.3.2), Third stood out from the

other male individuals on the show by code-mixing at the clausal level, not the lexical level. An example of Third's unique pattern can be observed in (19) below:

(19): **นิกกี้ ถอด สูท ของมัน ออกมา แล้ว มัน ก็ แบบ** I'm like you look pretty good.

Nikki tord suit kongman aukma laew man kor bab I'm like you look pretty good

Nikki took off suit his out and it um like I'm like you look pretty good.

'Nikki took off his suit and I'm like you look pretty good.'

It may be that Third code-mixed more frequently at the clausal level, e.g. in (19), than other male individuals because of his background in using English, as gleaned from a statement he made outside of the context of the show. He is studying Business English in an international program taught in English at a university in Bangkok. He was also asked by one of the mentors on the show why he did not speak Thai well and he answered, "because I study in an international program[5]." Given this background, it may be that he feels more comfortable using English than any other male individuals, and that could account for his advanced skills in switching skills at the clausal level.

Male cast's code-mixing patterns. The discussion of the male cast's code-mixing patterns is in the following order: code-mixing to show expertise in modeling and fashion industries and code-mixing to challenge someone.

One code-mixing pattern that can be observed from the data of the male cast is, unlike the female cast, the usage of code-mixing is usually adopted more when the individuals on the show are stating positive sentences, talking about fashion, and modeling-related topics. Mentors usually are the ones who talk about fashion and modeling topics with English code-mixing. An

[5] International programs in Thai universities often have English curricula in which English is used as primary teaching instructions in classes.

example of male mentor, Moo Asava, code-mixing to show his expertise within the fashion/modeling topic can be seen in (20) below:

(20): **เดิน แบบ กึ่ง** androgynous **ก็ ได้ เดิน ให้ เป็น ผู้หญิง ก็ โอเค**

Dern Bab Keung androgynous kor dai dern hai bhen puying kor okay

Walk like half androgynous is fine walk like is women particle okay

'He is able to walk in an androgynous way and he can also walk like a woman.'

Example (20) above illustrates mentor Moo Asava's professional comment on one of his mentees for having a variety of styles of walking on a fashion runway. According to Moo Asava, the mentee, Third, can walk in both feminine and masculine ways. This example is one way for Moo Asava to show his expertise in fashion runway walk.

In addition, the data collected revealed that the male cast code-mixed more frequently to challenge others. This is usually done more frequently by male contestants than the mentors. Although most male contestants challenged another person by code-mixing, an example below (21) is of a male contestant, Third, code-switching[6] to challenge his fellow teammate, Nikki.

(21): **เตริ์ด ไม่ อยาก พูด ไร อ่ะ เตริ์ด ว่า รูป เตริ์ด ดี อ่ะ** Oh Nikki, I just throw shade on you by the way.

Third mai yark pud rai ah third wa roob third dee ah Oh Nikki, I just throw shade on you by the way.

Third no want speak what particle third say picture Third good particle Oh Nikki, I just throw shade on you by the way

'I don't want to say it but I think my picture looks good. Oh Nikki, I just throw

[6]Although code-switching is rare within the male cast, I chose this utterance by Third because it has the clearest theme of a male individual challenging another person.

shade on you by the way.'

As reflected in (21), it can be observed that Third was challenging his teammate, Nikki, by claiming that his photoshoot pictures from one of their weekly tasks looked stunning. With this statement, Third implied that his pictures look better than Nikki's. He also claimed that he "threw shade" at Nikki, which according to Urban Dictionary, to throw shade at someone means to publicly denounce or disrespect a friend or an acquaintance ("Urban Dictionary: Throw shade", 2018).

Based on (20) and (21), the theories raised by François Grosjean (1982) can be observed. The factors influencing the mentors to code-mix when giving professional comments to mentees is to change the role of speakers. It may be that code-mixing with English lexical terms can portray one's expertise and authority. Regarding code-mixing to challenge someone, one factor proposed by Grosjean (1982) is that people code-switch/mix when they feel that they want to express annoyance or anger at their opponents in a conversation.

Regarding the domain of language use raw count results in the previous chapter, like female mentors, male mentors also code-mixed more frequently than their mentees (contestants) in the employment domain. Furthermore, when investigating the code-mixed constructions within that domain, I can report that most of the English vocabularies are nouns, adjectives, and verbs respectively. Nouns used by mentors Moo Asava and Peach include vocabularies which are related to fashion and modeling industry-related tasks such as *model, agency, choreography, performance, hard-sell,* etc. These nouns were usually used within the context of modeling-related tasks that the contestants had to perform and compete such as in photoshoot, and in a TV commercial advertisement production tasks. Only a few of the nouns found were employed within the context of applying for a job. Therefore, the employment domain in this case refers to

fashion and modeling related terms adopted within the weekly tasks on the show. Notwithstanding, adjectives used by the male mentors were to describe the appearance of some of the male contestants and on how well or poorly each contestant performed in certain tasks. They are also mostly used to describe the difficulty of each weekly task presented on each episode as well. Examples of these adjectives are *androgynous, weak, flat, chemical,* etc.

In terms of male contestants, raw counts showed that they code-mixed more frequently in the friendship domain than in employment and education domains. When examining the code-mixing vocabularies within the friendship domain, it is worthwhile to mention that most of the English vocabularies are nouns and adjectives.

Considering the timeframe of the five episodes of the show, all male mentors, Moo Asava and Peach, present consistent numbers of code-mixing. No dramatic fluctuation in number was observed. Nonetheless, contestant, PK, has a very unique pattern of code-mixing incidence compared to other contestants. He code-mixed most frequently toward the end of all five episodes. His average number of code-mixing started with 12 in the first episode, dropped in the middle to 6 and went back up to 24 in the fifth episode. It is possible that the reason mentors Moo Asava and Peach code-mixed almost equally throughout the five episodes is because male individuals seem to pay less attention to their status. They did not have the need to convey their power or expertise in the beginning to make the contestants feel intimidated yet. Perhaps they believed there are other ways to portray power than just through the use of language or code-mixing. I also believe that male mentors are more relaxed when directing their contestants. They seem to care less about their celebrity status than the female mentors despite having equivalent time to speak on the show. However, this speculation needs further investigation in future studies. Additionally, since there are more male contestants on the show than the female version,

each male bilingual contestant was only given about one minute to speak per each episode. This is dramatically less than the time that male mentors were given to speak.

To conclude, this subsection has shown that, similar to the female cast, the male cast also employed code-mixing—a form that may be regarded as a non-standard variety in the larger context of Thai language and society— to communicate within the community of modeling reality television shows. A variety of code-mixing patterns as well as the factors influencing them to code-mix also emerged from the way they code-mixed. It can be interpreted here that Thai male cast on the show conform to the community of franchised reality television shows from the western world and predominantly female fashion industries where English, or Thai-English code-mixing is expected to be heard from the male bilingual individuals.

Chapter VI: Conclusion

My first research question asked whether there are any differences in frequency of code-mixing by male and female casts in Thai reality television shows and if so, what are they? My results showed that the female cast code-mixed more frequently than the male cast. Nonetheless, the T-test statistical result demonstrated that the difference is statistically insignificant, meaning that the female cast may not code-mix more than the male cast in the future. Moreover, the statistically insignificant result may be because of drastically uneven sample size of the male and female casts. There are thirteen bilingual individuals in the male cast whereas the female cast only has four bilingual individuals. My result also showed that they do not support the theory proposed by Trudgil, 1972; Shuy, Wolfram & Riley, 1967, Kiesling 1998, and Kiesling 2008, which claims that women use less non-standard form (code-switching/code-mixing) of language than men, if we consider a mixed variety as "non-standard". However, it can be argued that while a mixed variety may be considered non-standard in the larger context of Thai language, culture, and society, the status of such form may be the norm for bilinguals within the community of practice studied in the present work. The reasons for why female cast code-mixed more frequently than their counterpart may include, first, the format of the show being adapted from westernized English-speaking shows which only the female cast versions have been produced. The second reason may be that the show revolves around the westernized fashion and modeling industries which are predominantly female and English oriented. Third, females, more than males on the shows, may feel that they belong in a higher socio-economic class by adopting the practice of Thai-English code-mixing more frequently in order to represent themselves with the prestige that may come from using the English language and talking about western fashion trends. The concept of *standard forms of language* may be variable to different communities of

practice. Again, to the community of Thai reality television shows, Thai-English code-mixing may be the norm or the standard form of language which may explain the results why both the female and male casts on the shows code-mixed. They did not employ only Thai language at every linguistic level in their conversations.

Regarding the second sub-question which asks whether there are any differences of code-mixing by mentors and contestants, my result showed statically significant result that mentors code-mixed more than contestants. This may be due to the fact that all mentors on the shows have celebrity statuses and they may feel the need to convey their expertise and power through the use of mixing English and Thai linguistic units, which signifies prestige in Thailand. In addition, the famous mentors on the shows were expected to be teachers to the contestants. This could mean that they were afforded more time to speak and to give directions/advices on the shows, allowing for more incidents of code-mixing. On the other hand, most contestants were newcomers to the industry who had not been discovered yet as a celebrity. Their numbers were also much higher than the mentors. Therefore, they were provided with less chances to speak on the show, which means less chances for incidence of code-mixing to take place.

The results also revealed different patterns of code-mixing that the male and female casts adopted on different segments of the shows, for different reasons, and at different morpho-syntactic levels at which switching took place. For the female cast, they tended to code-mix more frequently in the confessional sections of the show. Furthermore, they code-mixed more frequently when they utter negative and sarcastic statements. One contestant, Tisha, showed a rare code-mixing pattern which stood out from how the rest of the female cast code-mixed. She code-mixed more frequently at the clausal level while the other female individuals did at the lexical level.

The addressee made a difference in when to code-mix. As for the male cast, unlike the female cast, they tended to code-mix more frequently when they had group meetings or when they had conversations with one another than in confessional sections of the show. The type of statement seemed to make a difference as well: the data showed that they code-mixed more frequently when they uttered positive and challenging statements. Further, while most contestants switched to English at the lexical level, one contestant, Third, showed a rare (within this data set) code-mixing pattern which stood out from how the rest of the male cast code-mixed. He code-mixed more frequently at the clausal level while the other male individuals did at the lexical level.

In terms of domains of language use, the data presented in this study may be misleading because it has not been standardized based on the time limit each individual used on the shows. However, based on the raw count numbers, female mentors code-mixed most frequently in the domains of education (100%), employment (96%), and friendship (26.4%). For female contestants, the most frequently code-mixed domains are friendship (73.5%), employment (3.3%), and education (0%). As for male mentors, they code-mixed most frequently in the domains of education (100%), employment (79.2%), and friendship (16.8%). For male contestants, the most frequently code-mixed domains are friendship (83.1%), employment (20.7%), and education (0%).

As discussed in section 4.4 in chapter 4, this study's limitation includes the unstandardized raw count numbers in each domain of language use by both female and male casts. The numbers were not standardized based on the length of time. Thus, higher numbers may not indicate higher value. Future studies on this topic may need to consider the duration and the speed of each individual's speech to obtain more accurate number of each cast's average

number of code-mixing in each domain of language use.

Any existing language in use is alive and constantly evolving. Instead of controlling the evolution of language, we should refrain from corrupting it. As seen in this study, Thai language has demonstrated to accept foreign lexemes in various ways. Some Thai people may believe that Thai-English code-mixing is a corruption to Thai language. However, this idea is still controversial and needs to be discussed in further details in public.

References

Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*, Chicago: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Bokamba, E. (1988). Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory:. *Lingua*, *76*(1), 21-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(88)90017-4 Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Bokamba, E. (1989). Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing?. *World Englishes, 8(3),* 277-292. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1989.tb00669.x

Di Pietro, R. (1977). Code-Switching as a verbal strategy among bilinguals. In *Current themes in linguistics: bilingualism, experimental linguistics and language typologies*, ed. F. Eckman. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing.

Diebold, A. R. (1964). Incipient bilingualism In D. Hymes (ed.) *Language in Culture and Society,495-511,* New York: Harper and Row.

Eckert, P. (2016). To appear in 2006. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Elsevier. Communities of Practice Penelope Eckert. *Communities*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.2337/diacare.21.5.706.

Eckert, P. & McConnell-Ginet, S. (1992). Communities of practice: Where language, gender and power all live. *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conferenc*e. K. Hall, M. Buchholtz and B. Moonwomon. Berkeley, Berkeley Women and Language Group, University of California**:** 89-99.

Ello. (2018). Ello. Uos.de. Retrieved 18 March 2018, from http://www.ello.uos.de/field.php/sociolinguistics/standardandprestige

Fantini, A. (1985). *Language Acquisition of a Bilingual Child: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*, San Diego: College Hill Press.

Fishman, J., Cooper, R.L. & Ma, R. (1971). *Bilingualism in the Barrio*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutenberg, P. (2018). *Prestige (sociolinguistics) Project Gutenberg Self-Publishing - eBooks Read eBooks online*. *Self.gutenberg.org*. Retrieved 20 April 2018, from http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/eng/prestige_(sociolinguistics)

Hamers, J. & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). Bilingual and Bilingualism, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. Vol. I: The Bilingual Community; Vol. II: The American Dialects of Norwegian*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hill, A. (2005). *Reality TV: audiences and popular factual television*. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.

Hoffman, C. (1971). *An Introduction to Bilingualism*, London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, London: Longman.

Huff, R. (2006). *Reality television*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.

Independent T-Test - An introduction to when to use this test and what are the variables required Laerd Statistics. (2018). *Statistics.laerd.com*. Retrieved 17 April 2018, from https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/independent-t-test-statistical-guide.php

Jinyu, D. (2014). Study on Gender Differences in Language Under the Sociolinguistics. *Canadian Social Sciences*, 10(3), 92-96.

Kannaovakun, P., & Gunther C. A. (2001). *The mixing of English and Thai in Thai televisions programs: characteristics, attitudes, perceptions, and motivations*. Retrieved from http://elibrary.trf.or.th/.

Kiesling, S. F. (1998). Men's identities and sociolinguistic variation: The case of fraternity men. *Journal Of Sociolinguistics*, 2(1), 69-99.

Kiesling, S. (2008). Men, masculinities, and language. *Social And Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*(4), 653-673.

Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman's Place. *Language in Society*, *2*(1), 45–80. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707

Lave, J. & E. Wenger (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.

Mackey, W. F. (1968). The description of bilingualism. In J. M. Fishman (ed.) *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 555-584, The Hague: Mouton.

Masavisut, N., Sukwiwat, M., & Wongmontha, S. (1986). The power of the English language in Thai media. *World Englishes*, *5*(2-3), 197-207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.1986.tb00726.x

Myers-Scotton, C., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual Strategies: The Social Functions of Code-Switching. *Linguistics*, *15*(193). http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ling.1977.15.193.5

Nordquist, R. (2017). *Prestige Language or Dialect - Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms - Definition and Examples*. *ThoughtCo*. Retrieved 20 April 2018, from https://www.thoughtco.com/linguistic-prestige-1691533

Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Oxford [u.a.]: Blackwell.

Rosenthal, A. (1995). *Writing docudrama: dramatizing reality for film and TV*. Boston: Focal Press, c1995.

Sebba, M. & Wooton, T. (1998). We, they and identity: sequential v. identity-related explanations in CS. In Auer, 1998c, 262-290.

Shuy, R. W., Wolfram, W. A. & Riley, W. K. (I967). Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech. Cooperative Research Project 6-I 347. East Lancing: U.S. Office of Education.

Snidvongs, N. (1959). *Siam at the accession of King Mongkut: relations with the west.* Bangkok: Tironasarn Printing House.

Sridhar S. and Sridhar, K. (1980). The syntax and psycholinguistics of bilingual code-switching. Canadian Journal of Psychology 34, 407-416.

Sukwiwat, M. (1985). *The status and the role of the English language in Thailand.* Research report prepared for USIA, Bangkok, Thailand.

Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997). Language and identity. In Coulmas, 1997, 315-326.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You Just Don't Understand*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Tatsioka, Z. (2010). English loanwords and code-switching on the Greek television: the effects and the attitude of the public. Retrieved from http://www.ros.hw.ac.uk/handle/10399/2392

Thai PBS. (2017). *Thailand ranks third in Asia Pacific for having high ratio of women in senior management positions - Thai PBS English News*. *Thai PBS English News*. Retrieved 19 April 2018, from http://englishnews.thaipbs.or.th/thailand-ranks-third-asia-pacific-high-ratio-women-senior-management-positions/

Thomason, S. (2001). *Language contact* (1st ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language In Society*, *1*(02), 179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500000488.

Urban Dictionary: Throw shade. (2018). *Urban Dictionary*. Retrieved 24 April 2018, from https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Throw%20shade

Wolfram, W., Schilling-Estes, N., Myrick, C., & Schneier, J. (2016). American English (3rd ed., p. 174, 232, 261). UK: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Appendix A: Number of times each female bilingual individual code-mixes in a given period of time per episode

The Face Thailand Season 2 Episode 1 (Female):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Lukkade	5	36	7.2	28	0	8
Cris	5	21	4.2	20	0	6
Tisha	2	6	3	0	0	6
Jessie	2	0	0	0	0	0

The Face Thailand Season 2 Episode 2 (Female):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Lukkade	5	25	5	10	2	3
Cris	5	24	4.8	19	5	0
Tisha	35 sec	7	12	2	0	5
Jessie	51 sec	2	2.3	0	0	2

The Face Thailand Season 2 Episode 3 (Female):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Lukkade	5	22	4.4	16	6	0
Cris	5	52	10.4	18	34	0
Tisha	1:21	17	12.5	2	0	15
Jessie	30 sec	14	28	0	0	14

The Face Thailand Season 2 Episode 4 (Female):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Lukkade	5	34	6.8	30	4	0
Cris	5	27	5.4	11	16	0
Tisha	35 sec	2	3.4	0	0	2
Jessie	30 sec	2	4	0	0	2

The Face Thailand Season 2 Episode 5 (Female):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Lukkade	5	45	9	36	5	4
Cris	5	27	5.4	13	12	2
Tisha	41 sec	10	14.7	0	0	10
Jessie	1:07 sec	11	9.9	3	0	8

Appendix B: Number of times each male cast code-mixes in a given period of time per episode

The Face Men Thailand Season 1 Episode 1 (Male):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Moo	5	74	14.8	54	15	5
Peach	3:05	40	12	40	0	0
Phillip	1	6	6	0	0	6
Joseph	1	4	4	0	0	4
Nikki	1	0	0	0	0	0
PK	1	12	12	0	0	12
Attila	1	1	1	0	0	1
Bank	1	0	0	0	0	0
Third	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mickey	1	2	2	0	0	2
Gun	1	2	2	2	0	0
Thyme	1	0	0	0	0	0
Jack	1	7	7	0	0	7

The Face Men Thailand Season 1 Episode 2 (Male):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Moo	5	71	14.2	50	21	0
Peach	5	41	8.2	22	19	0
Phillip	1	2	2	2	0	0
Joseph	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nikki	1	0	0	0	0	0
PK	1	4	4	0	0	4
Attila	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bank	1	8	5	8	0	0
Third	1	6	6	4	0	2
Mickey	1	0	0	0	0	0
Gun	1	0	0	0	0	0
Thyme	1	2	2	2	0	0
Jack	1	2	2	2	0	0

The Face Men Thailand Season 1 Episode 3 (Male):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Moo	5	61	12.2	33	28	0
Peach	3:52	21	5.4	17	4	0
Phillip	1	0	0	0	0	0
Joseph	1	1	1	0	0	1
Nikki	1	2	2	0	0	2
PK	1	6	6	0	0	6
Attila	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bank	1	4	4	2	0	2
Third	1	3	3	0	0	3
Mickey	1	1	1	1	0	0
Gun	1	0	0	0	0	0
Thyme	1	1	1	0	0	1
Jack	1	2	2	0	0	2

The Face Men Thailand Season 1 Episode 4 (Male):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Moo	3:35	58	16.2	46	12	0
Peach	3:15	27	8.3	23	4	0
Phillip	1	0	0	0	0	0
Joseph	1	9	9	7	0	2
Nikki	1	0	0	0	0	0
PK	1	9	9	4	0	5
Attila	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bank	1	10	10	10	0	0
Third	1	20	20	5	0	15
Mickey	1	6	6	6	0	0
Gun	1	0	0	0	0	0
Thyme	1	4	4	4	0	0
Jack	1	3	3	2	0	1

The Face Men Thailand Season 1 Episode 5 (Male):

	First 5 minutes or less of each bilingual's speech	Number of code-mixing occurred	Average (Number of code-mixing per minute)	Employment Domain	Education Domain	Friendship Domain
Moo	5	59	11.8	28	21	10
Peach	3:02	39	12	19	16	4
Phillip	1	0	0	0	0	0
Joseph	1	0	0	0	0	0
Nikki	1	0	0	0	0	0
PK	1	24	24	16	0	8
Attila	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bank	1	5	5	4	0	1
Third	1	3	3	0	0	3
Mickey	1	6	6	2	0	4
Gun	1	0	0	0	0	0
Thyme	1	2	2	2	0	0
Jack	1	2	2	2	0	0